

BIDDING FAREWELL TO HIS EXCELLENCY, AMBASSADOR GALLAGHER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to offer some brief comments, if I may, regarding a good friend to many of us here who will be returning to his country in the next few days. I speak of Dermot A. Gallagher, Mr. President, the current Ambassador of Ireland to the United States.

Mr. President, Dermot Gallagher can leave the United States with pride in the work that he has done for his Government and his country.

I have had the privilege, Mr. President, of working closely with Dermot over the last 6 years, as many of us have. It has been an extremely positive experience, and I have come to consider Dermot not only a competent diplomat, but a good friend, and a good friend to this country. Without doubt, Dermot Gallagher is a consummate professional, an able and talented diplomat, and an individual who has served his country with skill and grace. And in no small measure, he has been assisted in that process by his lovely wife Maeve who has been a partner in this endeavor of theirs over the last number of years.

It goes without saying that Ambassador Gallagher has had an extraordinarily busy and productive tenure as Ireland's Ambassador in Washington. From early 1994 until the present, Ireland, and particularly the Northern Ireland peace process, have been front-burner issues for the Irish, the British, and our own Government.

Naturally, Dermot Gallagher has been in the thick of all of it. He has been an effective spokesman for his Government with the State Department, the White House, and the Congress. He has also been enormously helpful, I might point out, Mr. President, to those of us who have been actively involved in trying to get the peace process back on track in that country following the tragic decision of the IRA last year to break the August 1994 cease-fire.

Ambassador Gallagher may be returning home to Dublin, but I am confident he will remain actively involved in many of the same issues with which he has become so intimately knowledgeable. I say this because Ambassador Gallagher will be returning to Dublin to assume the position of Second Secretary General within the Department of Foreign Affairs, where he will continue to play a major role in Anglo-Irish issues, especially in the Northern Ireland peace process.

Given the recent events in Drumcree, where once again violence erupted, Mr. President, in connection with the annual Orange Order parade season, he will have his work cut out for him. Dermot will play a critical role in advising the newly elected Irish prime minister, Bertie Ahern, on the most effective policies for the Irish Government to pursue in order to restore a climate of trust, peace, and reinvigo-

rate the currently stalled peace process.

So, Mr. President, I know again I speak for all of my colleagues here when I bid Ambassador Gallagher and his wife Maeve and their family a farewell and a thank you for a job very well done. We continue to look forward to working with him in the years ahead.

DEVELOPMENTS IN CAMBODIA CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for those of us who follow events in Southeast Asia closely, recent developments in Cambodia are a cause for great concern.

The coup d'etat—and, yes, I employ that term even if the Department of State, for broader foreign policy reasons, does not—staged this week by Second Prime Minister Hun Sen is a terrible setback for that strife-torn country. Tragically, the expression by Mao Tse-Tung that “power grows out of the barrel of a gun” applies nowhere more so than Cambodia. A peace process initiated in 1991, culminating in the Paris peace accords, and manifested most significantly in the 1993 elections is dying.

The investment in that country since the signing of the 1991 accord by the international community of more than \$3 billion, including \$160 million from the United States, has clearly failed to eliminate from Cambodia the intertwining of politics and violence. The removal from power of the Khmer Rouge, one of the most vicious guerrilla movements in history—the very people for whom Cambodia has become synonymous with the image of bloodshed on a monumental scale—has not eliminated from the minds of Cambodia's leaders the notion of “power from the barrel of a gun.”

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter in Congress of facilitating the development of normal political and economic relationships with former adversaries in the Far East. I supported the opening of diplomatic relations with Vietnam and the extension of most-favored-nation trade status to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. With many other Members of Congress, I have invested considerable time and effort to helping secure a peaceful and prosperous future for a region that has known decades of warfare unimaginable to most Americans. I can only now fear for the future. The coup by Hun Sen represents a reversal of fortune that will prove, I fear, extremely difficult to resolve. The culture of violence that dominates major factions in Cambodia is alive and well and once again in power.

The response to the coup by the Clinton administration is understandably tempered by the knowledge that we will have to deal with the new regime as a simple fact of life, as well as within a broader regional context. It is that regional context that worries me as

much as the developments inside Cambodia. The visit by Hun Sen to Hanoi immediately prior to his takeover of Phnom Penh sends a chilling message to those of us concerned about the region's future. Whether Vietnam is culpable in the events in Cambodia is an issue that demands, and presumably will receive, serious attention.

The American public remains extraordinarily wary of any involvement by this country in Southeast Asia. That is understandable given the history of United States involvement there as well as memories of the years of terror in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge. That concern cannot and should not be ignored. That is why I was never under any doubt about the popularity of some of my positions with regard to Southeast Asia. The United States, however, must remain engaged there. It cannot turn its back on a region of great importance to the entire Far East. Conflict in Indochina, during a period when countries circle each other warily over specks in the South China Sea that may or may not be rich in oil and natural gas, can easily have wider implications. We must work to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia. Both morally and practically, we must stay engaged.

I have met a number of times in the past with Hun Sen. He is a tough individual not vulnerable to intimidation. He is capable of acting as ruthlessly as he deems necessary. His troops have actively sought out Members of Cambodia's elected Parliament with the clear intent of imprisoning those who oppose him and incorporating into his movement those who do not. Cambodia's interior minister was captured and executed. Sam Rainsy, president of the Khmer National Party and a friend of some of ours, expressed the situation appropriately when he asked, only partly rhetorically,

On what ground, following what rule, what law, what article of the Constitution, what legal procedure can the Second Prime Minister unilaterally “dismiss” the First Prime Minister . . . (Only with the backing of his tanks Hun Sen gave to himself the right to dismiss the First Prime Minister and to announce the formation of a new government.)

A reign of terror has been launched and a shadow has fallen over a country now known more for its violence than its awesome natural beauty. Gunfire around the Angkor Wat Temple, revered by Buddhism and universally identified with solemnity, provides a sad contrast that illustrates all too well the tragic fate of Cambodia. The international community, which invested so much time, energy, prestige, and money in establishing in Cambodia a democratic form of government and the opportunity for the same peaceful and prosperous future enjoyed by so many of Asia's countries, can be forgiven if it does not attempt a repeat of its efforts earlier this decade.

The United States should, I believe, work to resolve this crisis and repair the damage. I would be hard-pressed at

the moment, however, to argue on behalf of foreign assistance for Cambodia while a government that took power via coup d'etat rules in Phnom Penh and the ousted FUNCINPEC party negotiates in the northwest with the Khmer Rouge. The administration must communicate more forcefully than it has to date to Hun Sen that his actions are unacceptable and it must meet with Prince Ranariddh while he is here in Washington at the highest possible level of government to convey our continued support for the democratically-elected government that was ousted. It must be reiterated that Hun Sen was made Second Prime Minister and the Cambodian People's Party given a sizable representation in Parliament not because of its popular support, which it lacks, but because of its history of extreme violence and willingness to employ that violence to attain its objectives. It must be illuminated the degree to which the international community bent over backward and the Cambodian people's interests sacrificed in order to bring the CPP into the coalition that was torn apart by the coup.

Mr. President, the tragedy that is Cambodia continues. The Senate as a body, the Congress as an institution, and the administration as this country's representative abroad must communicate the message that the recent events in Cambodia represent a reversal that cannot be accepted without a price. I, for one, stand ready to do my part.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 936, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 936) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Cochran/Durbin amendment No. 420, to require a license to export computers with composite theoretical performance equal to or greater than 2,000 million theoretical operations per second.

Grams amendment No. 422 (to amendment No. 420), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the availability and potential risks relating to the sale of certain computers.

Coverdell (for Inhofe/Coverdell/Cleland) amendment No. 423, to define depot-level maintenance and repair, to limit contracting for depot-level maintenance and repair at installations approved for closure or realignment in 1995, and to modify authorities and requirements relating to the performance of core logistics functions.

Lugar modified amendment No. 658, to increase (with offsets) the funding, and to improve the authority, for cooperative threat reduction programs and related Department of Energy programs.

Gorton amendment No. 645, to provide for the implementation of designated provider agreements for uniformed services treatment facilities.

Wellstone amendment No. 669, to provide funds for the bioassay testing of veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during military service.

Wellstone modified amendment No. 668, to require the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$400,000,000 to the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to provide funds for veterans' health care and other purposes.

Wellstone modified amendment No. 670, to require the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$5,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide funds for outreach and startup for the school breakfast program.

Wellstone modified amendment No. 666, to provide for the transfer of funds for Federal Pell Grants.

Gorton/Murray/Feinstein amendment No. 424, to reestablish a selection process for donation of the USS Missouri.

Murkowski modified amendment No. 753, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the options available to the Department of Defense for the disposal of chemical weapons and agents.

Kyl amendment No. 607, to impose a limitation on the use of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for destruction of chemical weapons.

Kyl amendment No. 605, to advise the President and Congress regarding the safety, security, and reliability of United States Nuclear weapons stockpile.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are now back on the defense authorization bill, S. 936. We are ready to take up amendments. I want to inform my colleagues, if you have an amendment, come to the floor and present it. We are ready to act on these amendments. We have to finish this bill this week. We have lots of amendments. If you want your amendment acted on, you better come to the floor and see about it, otherwise we are going to proceed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to comment on one of the most important authorization bills to be debated by the Senate each year, the defense authorization bill. In fact, if you consider that the first duty of government is to assure the life and freedom of its people, then this is the most important authorization bill we will take up this year.

Our debate, like most of what we do on this floor, will eventually produce a

law. In our democracy, Mr. President, law is really our collective national imagining of how something should be. In this debate, America imagines its Armed Forces and crafts a law that authorizes their existence and shapes them to their tasks. This law has global reach and global consequences; so we should approach this debate with seriousness, with respect for those who serve, and respect toward those who wrestle with these issues on a daily basis.

Deserving respect in the latter category are our colleagues who serve on the Armed Services Committee. They have produced a good bill, on balance, and they have done an exceptionally difficult task in putting together this legislation because they have to consider not only the threats to the Nation and the nonnegotiable requirements to repel those threats today, but also to support the force that is already deployed, as they are in Bosnia. They also face tough budget limitations, along with the demands of competing bureaucracies and those in the private sector who supply equipment and services for defense. Our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee must balance near-term with long-term, readiness with research, and through it all keep their eyes focused on the overall good of protecting the Nation. Mr. President, I thank them for taking on this tough task and producing such a good product. I especially thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Michigan for their fine work on this legislation.

National strategy should be the basis for our consideration of the Defense authorization, and strategy is illuminated by history. We have a history, in the aftermath of decisive military involvement overseas, of withdrawing from foreign commitments. The surest sign of our withdrawal has always been the deep reduction of our Armed Forces. After World War I, we listened to our isolationist instincts, refused to join the League of Nations which our own President had created, and cut our military to the bare bones. Absent our leadership, Europe and Asia developed into a conflict which killed 50 million people—a conflict which only renewed American engagement could win. Again, after World War II, we deeply cut our military, only to be shocked into rearmament by the initial victories of Communist forces in Korea—forces which might well have been deterred had we kept our forces capable. Again, after Vietnam we deeply cut our forces but fortunately rebuilt them when it became clear that our military was less capable than our national strategy required. We wisely rearmed and created a force which outlasted the Soviet Union and won a historic victory in the cold war.

The clear lessons of history are: Stay engaged in the world and keep our Armed Forces congruent with the national strategy and with the threats we